

1 THE HONORABLE JOHN C. COUGHENOUR  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6

7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
8 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
9 AT SEATTLE

10 ROLAND MA,

11 Plaintiff,

v.

12 DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION and  
13 UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN  
14 CALIFORNIA,

Defendants.

CASE NO. C19-0399-JCC

ORDER

16 This matter comes before the Court on Plaintiff's emergency motion to stay (Dkt. No.  
17 72). On July 2, 2019, the Court issued a minute order striking a status conference that was  
18 scheduled for July 16, 2019 and directing the parties to file a proposed scheduling order. (Dkt.  
19 No. 71.) On July 5, 2019, Plaintiff filed a one-page motion asking the Court to stay all  
20 proceedings. (Dkt. No. 72.) Plaintiff asked for a stay due to:

21 all [of his] 'digital devices' [being] seized by the Seattle Police Department (Exhibit  
22 A), including but not limited to: home phones, cell phones, smart watch, computers,  
23 laptops, tablet, printers, thumb drive, hard drive, and xbox drive. The safe that the  
police seized without a court order has all of Plaintiff's travel documents too.

24 It is moot to attend the status conference with nothing at all, including the  
knowledge of all events, as well as the prerequisite of entering the courthouse -  
Photo ID.

26 (Id.) Plaintiff attached to his motion a copy of a search warrant issued by the Seattle Municipal

1 Court on July 1, 2019 in an ongoing criminal prosecution against Plaintiff. (Dkt. No. 72-1.)

2 Plaintiff has not provided a reason to justify a stay of proceedings. First, the Court  
3 already struck the previously scheduled status conference, so Plaintiff's references to that  
4 hearing as a basis for granting a stay are irrelevant. Second, the confiscation of Plaintiff's  
5 electronic devices does not necessarily preclude him from litigating this case, as evidenced by  
6 his filing of the present motion. Finally, the criminal case in which the search warrant was issued  
7 is entirely unrelated to this civil lawsuit.

8 Therefore, Plaintiff's emergency motion for a stay (Dkt. No. 72) is DENIED. In  
9 accordance with the Court's prior order, Plaintiff shall meet and confer with Defendants about a  
10 proposed scheduling order no later than Friday, July 12, 2019. (See Dkt. No. 71.) If Plaintiff fails  
11 to meet and confer with Defendants as ordered, the Court may dismiss Plaintiff's lawsuit for  
12 failure to prosecute. *See Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b).*

13 DATED this 9th day of July 2019.

14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26



---

John C. Coughenour  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE